



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

### BOOK REVIEWS.

---

A HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES FOR SCHOOLS.—By John Fiske, Litt. D., LL.D. 8vo., pp. 474. Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston, Mass., 1894.

This beautiful volume, beautiful not only in its profuse illustrations, but in its type and general get up, is the work of one of America's most distinguished historians. Dr. Fiske has an attractive, indeed a charming style, and is a very full man on historical subjects, especially those relating to America. His volume has had an immense sale, and although only published in the summer of 1894, has already run through four editions. This remarkable success is due, not alone to the delightful style and great reputation of the author, it is largely, if not mostly, due to the admirable grouping of events, showing how one event naturally results from those preceding, and also to the manifest desire of the author to deal fairly with all sections of the country. The book is very popular at the South, because the South appreciates the effort of a Northern historian to do her justice, a thing not even attempted by many Northern historical writers heretofore. Southerners are induced to hope that this is the beginning of the end of the bitterness engendered between the two sections by the civil war, and the events which led to and followed it; that the days of reckless crimination and recrimination will, after a while, cease, and our great country will, at some time in the future, take equal pride in the heroism displayed by the Confederate, as in that shown by the Federal soldier, in the great civil war. We surely will not fall behind Great Britain in such a matter, and we know that now the memory of Cromwell is honored as that of one of England's greatest soldiers and rulers, and a motion to place his statue in Westminster Abbey has been made in Parliament, and will pass sooner or later. It will not be two and a half centuries before the statues of Lee, of Johnston and of Jackson, will adorn the Federal Capital, and the nation will honor them as among the greatest of its soldiers, if indeed, their names will not stand at the head of the military captains which have made glorious her history. Before that period arrives, we may be sure the motives which led the South to attempt secession from the Federal Union will be appreciated, and the problem of the colored brother will, we hope, be solved without serious injury to our free institutions.

The difficulty of compressing a history of North America for 300 years into a volume of 300 pages, has been fully appreciated by the author, who tells us in his preface that he has attempted, by proper

grouping, to keep up the interest which would attach to a fuller narrative of details. This grouping, as to the facts given, has been well done; but in condensing his material, the author has not always kept in mind the caution of Horace, "*Brevis esse laboro obscurus fio.*" He has sometimes failed to give the correct impression by omitting the necessary details in the matters related; take for instance the following passage, found at page 234: "In 1778, Col. Hamilton, the British commander at Detroit, tried to stir up all the western tribes to a concerted attack upon the frontier. A young Virginian, George Rogers Clark, hearing of this, undertook to carry the war into the enemy's country. In two romantic and masterly campaigns, in 1778-'9, he defeated and captured Hamilton at Vincennes, and ended by conquering and holding the whole country north of the Ohio river, from the Alleghanies to the Mississippi."

The reader of this, not otherwise familiar with this celebrated and most important conquest, would never know that Virginia claimed the territory north of the Ohio under her charter of 1609, and that her Governor sent out Clark with men raised on her own soil, who made the conquest for her. Indeed the author conveys the impression that Clark, of his own volition, with men, whom in some way he induced to go with him, conquered this vast territory for himself. As Virginia made good her charter rights to this territory, by conquest with her own soldiers, and thus secured the Mississippi as her western boundary, and afterwards deeded it to the United States on condition that they adopt the articles of confederation, events of supreme importance to the nation, one would think that children, for the first time learning American history, should have had the facts plainly stated. So far from giving a distinct idea of Virginia's part in this important matter, however, the author has misstated her claim under her charter of 1699. At page 66 he represents the grant to her by that charter as stretching across the continent in a straight strip or zone. The words of that grant are: "All those lands, countries and territories, situate, lying, and being in that part of America called Virginia, from the point of land called Cape or Point Comfort, all along the sea coast, to the northward two hundred miles, and from the said point of Cape Comfort, all along the sea coast to the southward two hundred miles, and all that space and circuit of land, lying from the sea coast of the precinct aforesaid, up into the land throughout, from sea to sea, west and north-west." Under this grant Virginia claimed that while her southern line was due west, her northern line was northwest, and upon this and on her driving the British out, she based her claim to the territory between the Ohio and the great lakes, which claim prevailed in the negotiations for peace that closed the Revolution, and thereby the United States was first extended to the Mississippi; fixed as the western boundary of the Colonies by the treaty between England and France,

in 1763, and afterwards found the way open to extend to the Pacific. In showing the logical connection of these great events, surely the charter claim of Virginia should have been the starting point.

Another instance of misleading statement is found at page 200, where it is stated in reference to the action of Virginia in organizing the Revolutionary movement in 1773, that "Dabney Carr provided for committees of correspondence between the several Colonies." This gives the whole credit of the movement to Dabney Carr, while he only acted the part assigned him by the most advanced patriots in the Virginia Assembly, in introducing the resolution already agreed on by them in conference. This we learn from Mr. Jefferson's statement, who says that it was at his solicitation that his connection, Dabney Carr was allowed to introduce the resolution, and in doing so, to make his *debut* as a new member.

Still another statement at page 248 must be contested. Writing of the period between the end of the Revolution and the framing of the Federal Constitution, the author states that "A party at the South was in favor of a separate Southern Confederacy." In his volume entitled "Civil Government in the United States," at page 255, the author makes the charge more definite, and says: "In Virginia there was a party in favor of a separate Southern Confederacy." I know of no evidence to sustain this statement, unless indeed it be the suspicions of Madison and Edward Carrington, appearing in their letters to Jefferson, in which they attempted to account for the opposition of Patrick Henry to the adoption of the unamended constitution by Virginia by suggesting such a motive to him. This suspicion had no ground on which to rest, and the fact was explicitly denied by Mr. Henry on the floor of the Virginia Convention. On the contrary, the design to divide the Union existed at the North at this period, as is stated by an author in his "Critical Period of American History," at page 211. (See also letter of James Monroe to Patrick Henry, "Henry's Patrick Henry," Volume II, page 297.)

I have said that the author has evidently endeavored to do justice to the South, but I trust that the South may be excused if, like Oliver Twist, it asks for more. The failure to do the South full justice may be properly designated as a sin of omission rather than a sin of commission. Some examples will be noted.

At page 71 the author states that criminals and others were sent from England to Virginia, and sold as indentured servants, bound to service for a limited time. The reader would conclude that this practice was confined to Virginia, as no mention is made as to its prevalence in the Northern colonies. The truth is that the Act of Parliament for the deportation of criminals applied to all the American colonies, and there were many indentured servants north.

Coming down to the period of the civil war, while the author does

not go fully into its causes, he gives a very fair account of them so far as he gives them at all. And in writing of the Southern generals he is not disposed to depreciate their abilities. But it is a striking fact that he seldom gives the number of soldiers engaged in the battles, except in the aggregate, and thus the disproportion of the armies engaged is not shown. Only two exceptions appear to this mode of stating facts. They are the battles of Antietam and Chancellorsville, in which the Confederate forces are put at half of the Federal. The omission of relative losses also is found in the notices of all the battles. These omissions prevent the reader from appreciating the great superiority of the Southern generals and soldiers over their opponents.

But, not to further point out faults, it must be confessed that it is very refreshing to a Southerner, so accustomed to disparagement, to read in a history by a Northern writer of eminence the following summing up of the great strife: "The war had been an honest and honorable contest, in which each side had been true to its convictions, and after making allowance for a certain amount of wrongful suffering inevitable in all wars, neither side had anything to be ashamed of."

Dr. Frank A. Hill, of Boston, has contributed to the volume very full questions and lists of books fit for collateral reading, and these go far to make up any deficiency in the text.

WILLIAM WIRT HENRY.

**SOME OLD HISTORICAL LANDMARKS OF VIRGINIA AND MARYLAND.**

By W. H. Snowden. 8vo., pp. 71. J. B. Lippincott, Philadelphia, Pa.

This handsome volume contains a storehouse of information about the celebrated localities in the general vicinity of Mt. Vernon, as well as about Mt. Vernon itself. Beginning with Alexandria, Mr. Snowden takes us to Broad Creek and Fort Washington, in Maryland, Belvoir, Pohick Church and Gunston Hall, and finally to Mt. Vernon itself, and to all the various places of interest on that historic estate. It is not merely a description of what is to be seen. Mr. Snowden has given a very full account of the history of each spot, and of the lives of the persons associated with it. Among the most interesting pages in the book are those devoted to Belvoir, the home of the Fairfaxes. Here Mr. Snowden has written with great feeling. Indeed, the sympathy of the writer breathes throughout the work, giving it a personal charm, which it would not otherwise possess. Visions of a past age flit through the mind of the reader as he turns over the pages, and some of its beauty and spirit is caught. This impression is increased by the interesting series of pictures which illustrate the book; such as Hollin Hall, Mt. Eagle, Belvoir, Woodlawn, the home of Nelly Custis, and

### PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

---

- Iowa Historical Record for January, 1895. Iowa City, Iowa.  
 Collections of Maine Historical Society, January, 1895. Portland, Maine, 1895.  
 William and Mary College Quarterly for January, 1895.  
 Huguenot Society of London Publications, Vol. V, Part II.  
 Pennsylvania Magazine for January, 1895.  
 Negro Suffrage in the South. By Prof. Stephen B. Weeks. Boston, Mass., 1895.  
 An Account of John Burbeen. By J. B. Walker. Concord, N. H., 1895.  
 Missouri Historical Society Collections. St. Louis, Mo., 1894.  
 American Geographical Society Bulletin for December, 1894.  
 Nebraska Historical Society Proceedings, Vol. X, No. 2.  
 Scotch Antiquary for January, 1895.  
 Southern Magazine for January, 1895.  
 Memorial Biographies of the New England Historical Genealogical Register. Boston, Mass., 1895.  
 Some Old Historical Landmarks of Virginia and Maryland. By W. H. Snowden. Philadelphia, Pa., 1895.  
 History of Edmund Poole and his Descendants. By Murray H. Poole. Ithaca, N. Y.  
 Proceedings of American Philosophical Society for May, 1894.  
 Montana Historical Society Reports, 1893-1894. Butte, Montana, 1895.  
 Merriam, Puffer, Badcock Sawyer Families. By W. S. Appleton. Boston, Mass., 1891.  
 Essex (Mass.) Historical Collections. Salem, Mass., 1893.  
 Sources of the Mississippi. By James H. Baker. St. Paul, 1894.  
 Putnam's Monthly and Ancestral Chart. Salem, Mass., 1895.  
 Minnesota Historical Collections for 1894.

---

ERRATA.—Attention is called to the following errors in the printing of Mr. Henry's review of Prof. Fiske's "History of the United States." On page 449, charter of 1699, should be charter of 1609. On page 450, "an" author of the critical of American History, should be "our" author.